



Close

From: GDendurent@aol.com [SMTP:GDendurent@aol.com]**To:** MIHS2District; christina.leonard@arizonarepublic.com; Andrew Kunasek - DIST3X; Don Stapley - DIST2X; Fulton Brock - DIST1X; Max Wilson - DIST4X; MaryRose Wilcox - DIST5X; hal@dendurent.com; ddendurent@hotmail.com; Latonda_G._Raft@omb.eop.gov**Cc:****Subject:** September 20, 2004 Proposed Intergovernmental Agreement**Sent:** 9/20/2004 1:53 PM**Importance:** Normal

I think the draft Intergovernmental Agreement released today is a great improvement over the previous draft. It reflects what I am sure is a lot of work including adding such things as legal citations and definitions. When Mr. Manos talked this morning about "access," I could look and see that he really meant "AHCCCS" and I could read what that was.

I note that both the County and the District are now required to comply with the law (and not just the District) (pursuant to section 13.7) and there is now a mechanism to resolve disagreements over whatever that means.

The slides for today's presentation to the County Board included an operating restriction to be attached to all deeds conveying (real?) property to the District and the lease of the Maricopa Medical Center. I could not find that restriction in the proposed Intergovernmental Agreement.

I remain firmly opposed to the imposition of such an operating restriction by the County Board on the soon-to-be-elected District Board. I note the following:

- ✍ Such a restriction would be perfectly in order for the transfer of land and the negotiation of a lease between private parties.
- ✍ However, this is a transfer/lease involving two public entities, each of which operates under the Arizona Constitution and applicable laws, and each of which has/or will have a governing Board elected by the voters of Maricopa County.
- ✍ The County Board worked for the establishment of the Hospital District by Arizona statute and to permit the voters to agree to the new District.

- ⌘ In a true sense, the property is not so much county property as it is public property (belonging to the voters *en mass* and not individually) and for which the county has been responsible to manage in the best interests of the public.
- ⌘ The Hospital District cannot operate as required by statute and as specifically approved by the voters without the transfer/lease of these properties. An attempt by the County Board to impose this operational restriction, in effect, is an attempt to undo/modify what has already been enacted into statute and approved by the voters. If this restriction was really needed (in addition to all the other applicable laws), it should have been in the enacted statute.
- ⌘ I commend the staff that came up with this approach for their creativity, but the approach while subtle, is mischievous and downright pernicious. When I was a bureaucrat trying to satisfy my political masters in similar situations, I always thought of myself as a “bu-rotten-crat.”

Best wishes,

Howard Dendurent

3785 South Joshua Tree Lane

Gilbert, AZ 85297-7990

480-988-9238



Close

From: ashley sherinian [SMTP:dasher@fastq.com]

To: MIHS2District

Cc:

Subject: A WOMAN'S RIGHT TO CHOOSE

Sent: 9/21/2004 5:13 PM

Importance: Normal

I am outraged by this whole scenario of making it a point to have these medical facilities anti abortion. There are already federal and state laws addressing this issue. It is outrageous that this issue is being pressed like this because someone feels so strongly PERSONALLY about it. Is he the only one who feels strongly???

To hear that the supervisors will probably go right ahead with it really is pathetic. Two thirds of this nation are Pro choice and they also feel very strongly about it.

Please have respect and sensitivity to women and their issues that belong strictly between them and their own doctors, not up to the supervisors with a personal agenda.

Sincerely,

Daniel and Ashley Sherinian



Close

From: Louise Judson [SMTP:judson1@cox.net]

To: MIHS2District

Cc:

Subject: Proposed regulation re pro choice

Sent: 9/21/2004 7:30 PM

Importance: Normal

It is my understanding that you will be discussing proposals as regards pro choice in the Maricopa Health system. Two-thirds of the people in this country are pro choice. It is also the law of the land and I find it unconcionable that you would try to make changes in the existing laws to accommodate a few right wing agenda driven people who try to foist their beliefs on everyone else. I do believe that the Bush Administration has emboldened these people to think they can control the majority. They shouldn't and they cannot. Thank you.

Louise Judson, Sun City West



Close

From: Zachary Winograd [SMTP:zacw@uccinc.net]

To: MIHS2District

Cc:

Subject: Abortion Ban

Sent: 9/21/2004 8:55 PM

Importance: Normal

If you include a ban on abortions in the deed of the Maricopa County Medical Center on the grounds that it is the murder of human cells, I will start a campaign to create an initiative amending the Arizona Constitution making it illegal for any member of the Board of Supervisors to cut their hair or nails while in office because that too is killing human cells.

Zachary Winograd



Close

From: David Harrowe [SMTP:David.Harrowe@gric.nsn.us]

To: MIHS2District

Cc:

Subject: deed restriction

Sent: 9/22/2004 3:17 PM

Importance: Normal

09/22/04

To the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors:

As a resident of Chandler, Arizona, I OPPOSE the proposed deed restriction forbidding abortions at Maricopa County Medical Center. I am "pro-choice", but this restriction goes beyond even current law because it would allow abortions only to save the mother's life. There are no allowances for rape, incest or to preserve the mother's health. The proposed deed restriction is an extreme measure to foist the theology of some on all the people of Maricopa County. It is just another step to make abortion illegal in this country -- and I strongly oppose it!

David Harrowe

P.O. Box 7555

Chandler, AZ 85246-7555



Close

From: Marygyger@aol.com [SMTP:Marygyger@aol.com]

To: MIHS2District

Cc:

Subject: proposed abortion ban

Sent: 9/22/2004 8:38 PM

Importance: Normal

Please do not stop funding for poor women who choose abortion. I pay taxes and vote and I hope you will continue to give women a choice: even those women who cannot afford a private doctor. Marianna Gyger



Close

From: v.voigt@cox.net [SMTP:v.voigt@cox.net]

To: MIHS2District

Cc: CopaNet - MIHSX

Subject: IGA draft

Sent: 9/23/2004 11:38 AM

Importance: Normal

I am writing to state my support for Section 6.3 of the proposed IGA draft for the District Policies of the Maricopa Medical Center. Please do not change this. The Arizona Republic seems to be trying to stir up dissension on this issue. If you were to take taxpayer money and use it for something that is morally and ethically wrong, as I and the majority of people in America believe abortion is, it would surely constitute a violation of our most basic human rights.

Sincerely, Valerie Voigt